

SECTION M
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD
Landing Gear Collaborative Supply Chain Integration
(LG-CSCI)
SOURCE SELECTION

1. BASIS FOR AWARDS

- 1.1.** This acquisition will utilize Tradeoff Source Selection Process in accordance with (IAW) FAR 15.101-1, as supplemented. The Landing Gear Collaborative Supply Chain Integration (LG-CSCI) contract will be awarded to the offeror who represents the best overall value to the Government, based upon an integrated assessment of Technical, Technical Risk, Past Performance, Price, and PLT Valued Requirement evaluation Factors, that is deemed responsible in accordance with the FAR, as supplemented, whose proposal conforms to the solicitation requirements. The solicitation requirements include all stated terms, conditions, representations, certifications, and all other information required by Section L and the Technical Requirements Document (TRD) of this solicitation. The Government intends to award to the offeror that gives the Government the greatest confidence that it will best meet, or exceed, the requirements. This may result in an award to a higher rated, higher priced offeror, where the decision is consistent with the evaluation factors, and the Source Selection Authority (SSA) reasonably determines that the Technical Ratings, Technical Risk ratings, and Past Performance ratings of higher price offeror outweigh the cost difference, after any potential PLT adjustments are made. The SSA will base the source selection decision on an integrated assessment of proposals against the source selection criteria in section M. While the Government Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB) and the SSA will strive for maximum objectivity, the source selection process, by its nature, is subjective; therefore, professional judgment is implicit throughout the entire process. Offerors are required to meet all solicitation requirements, including all stated terms, conditions, representations, certifications, and Technical requirements, in addition to those identified as evaluation factors or sub-factors and all other information required by Section L, Instructions to Offerors (ITO), of this solicitation.
- 1.2.** Number of Contracts to be Awarded – The Government intends to award one contract for the LG-CSCI program. However, the Government reserves the right to award no contract at all, if the SSA determines it is in the Government’s best interest. If the Government determines not to award a contract, the Government is not liable for any costs incurred.
- 1.3.** Correction Potential of Proposals – The Government will consider, throughout the evaluation, the "correction potential" of any deficiency. The judgment of such "correction potential" is within the sole discretion of the Government. If an aspect of an offeror's proposal does not meet the Government's requirements, the proposal may be considered “uncorrectable” and the offeror may be eliminated from the competitive range. A proposal will be considered “uncorrectable” if it is determined

that a significant proposal revision will be required in order to meet the minimum requirements of the Request for Proposal (RFP).

- 1.4. Discussions – The Government reserves the right to award without discussions; therefore, each initial offer should contain the offeror's best terms from a price and technical standpoint. If, during the evaluation period, it is determined to be in the best interest of the Government to hold discussions, offeror responses to Evaluation Notices (ENs) and the Final Proposal Revision (FPR) will be the basis for making the source selection decision. If the offeror's proposal has been evaluated as acceptable at the time discussions are closed, any changes or exceptions in the Final Proposal Revision are subject to evaluation and may introduce risk that the offeror's proposal be determined unacceptable or receive a lower technical rating or higher technical risk, or all three. The Government reserves the right to award without discussions, if the SSA determines it to be in the best interest of the Government.
- 1.5. Integrating Proposal Into the Contract – the Contracting Officer shall incorporate beneficial aspects of the selected offeror's proposal into the contract.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

2. EVALUATION FACTORS AND SUB-FACTORS

- 2.1. The following evaluation factors and sub-factors will be used to evaluate each proposal. Award will be made to the offeror whose proposal is most advantageous to the Government, based upon an integrated assessment of the evaluation factors and sub-factors described below:

Factor One – Technical

Sub-factor One: Engineering

Sub-factor Two: Program Management

Sub-factor Three: Order Fulfillment

Factor Two – Past Performance

Factor Three – Price

- 2.2. **Relative Importance of Factors and Sub-factors** – The relative importance of each factor and sub-factor is as follows (in descending order): First in importance is Factor One (Technical), second is Factor Two (Past Performance) and Factor Three (Price) is last in importance. Within the Technical Factor, the sub-factors are listed in descending order of importance. IAW FAR 15.304(e)(1), all evaluation factors other than Price when combined, are significantly more important than price. In arriving at a best value decision, the Government reserves the right to give positive consideration, i.e., assign a strength, for technical merit in excess of the threshold requirements.

The LG-CSCI Contract will be awarded to the offeror who represents the best overall value to the Government, based upon an integrated assessment (tradeoff) of Technical, Technical Risk, Past Performance, and Price

2.3. Definitions – For purposes of this evaluation the following definitions will be used:

- 2.3.1. Strength** – Is an aspect of an offeror’s proposal that has merit or exceeds specified performance or capability requirements in a way that will be advantageous to the Government during contract performance
- 2.3.2. Weakness** – Is a flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance
- 2.3.3. Significant Weakness** – Is a proposal flaw that appreciably increases the risk on unsuccessful contract performance
- 2.3.4. Deficiency** – Is a material failure of a proposal to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level
- 2.3.5. Production Lead Time (PLT)** – Is the date that funds are obligated for a given order to the delivery of the first 10% of that order.
- 2.3.6. Team Member** – Is any critical subcontractor that will have program level responsibility and oversight whose, capability, certifications, or qualifications are required to satisfy the Technical Factor.

2.4. FACTOR ONE, TECHNICAL - The technical evaluation provides for two distinct but related assessments (Technical and Technical Risk). These two ratings impact the rating of each technical sub-factor.

- 2.4.1. Technical Rating** - The technical rating provides an assessment of the quality and feasibility of the offeror’s solution for meeting the Government’s requirement.
- 2.4.2. Technical Risk Rating** - Assessment of Technical Risk, considers potential for disruption of schedule, increased costs, degradation of performance, the need for increased Government oversight, or the likelihood of unsuccessful contract performance.
- 2.4.3.** Each technical sub-factor will be evaluated and given a Technical Color Rating IAW Table 1, and a Technical Risk Rating IAW Table 2 - Technical Risk Ratings. An “Unacceptable” Rating IAW Table 1 or Table 2, for any sub-factor will render a proposal un-awardable.

Table 1 - Technical Color Ratings

Color	Rating	Description
Blue	Outstanding	Proposal indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements and contains multiple strengths.
Purple	Good	Proposal indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements and contains at least one strength.
Green	Acceptable	Proposal indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements.
Yellow	Marginal	Proposal has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements.
Red	Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet requirements of the solicitation and, thus, contains one or more deficiencies and is unawardable.

Table 2 - Technical Risk Ratings

Rating	Description
Low	Proposal may contain weakness(es) which have little potential to cause disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Normal contractor effort and normal Government monitoring will likely be able to overcome any difficulties.
Moderate	Proposal contains a significant weakness or combination of weaknesses which may potentially cause disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring will likely be able to overcome difficulties.
High	Proposal contains a significant weakness or combination of weaknesses which is likely to cause significant disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Is unlikely to overcome any difficulties, even with special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring.
Unacceptable	Proposal contains a material failure or a combination of significant weaknesses that increases the risk of unsuccessful performance to an unacceptable level

- 2.5. FACTOR TWO, PAST PERFORMANCE** – A past performance evaluation will be performed for all offerors. Past performance will be evaluated for Recency (IAW

4.3.1), Relevancy (IAW 4.4 and Table 6), and will receive an overall Performance Confidence Assessment rating based on the definitions in Table 5.

- 2.6. FACTOR THREE, PRICE** – A price evaluation will be performed for all offerors IAW Section 5 (Volume III – Factor Three, Price) of this document, and proposals will be evaluated based on a Total Proposed Price (TPP) with the possibility of adjustments IAW Section 3.3.3 (Volume IV - Factor Four, PLT Valued Requirement) resulting in a Total Evaluated Price (TEP).

3. VOLUME I – FACTOR ONE, TECHNICAL

- 3.1. Sub-factor One, Engineering:** This sub-factor is acceptable when it demonstrates the knowledge, experience, and expertise to meet the requirements of TRD section 4.0 and all sub-paragraphs. Further it the plan must provide an accurate and detailed understanding of landing gear manufacturing processes and substantiate quoted PLTs, and provide a timely and realistic solution to the scenario in section L paragraph 3.5.1.3.
- 3.1.1.** The sub-factor is exceeded when, IAW current Air Force Landing Gear Engineering policy, it provides and substantiates viable and executable innovations that will likely improve manufacturing processes, achieve higher quality, and/or reduce quality deficiencies.
- 3.2. Sub-factor Two, Program Management:** This sub-factor is acceptable when the approach demonstrates successful experience and knowledge of landing gear program management, specifically addressing risks and mitigation strategies involved in selection, oversight, on-time payment, mentorship, and motivation of sub-contractors. The plan must also successfully demonstrate the ability to break down multi-faceted programmatic issues to their core components, then provide an effective way forward while maintaining and sharing situational awareness with the Government Program Manager.
- 3.2.1.** The sub-factor is exceeded when the approach addresses in detail, the following supply chain challenges; sub-contractor management, demand and supply planning/forecasting (short and long term), supportability, management of critical resources, forgings, outside plating, associated with holistic support of all items listed in the TEP worksheet (the offeror may address additional supply chain challenges not listed). Further the approach must provide comprehensive and viable process and procedural solutions to identified challenges, that will likely result in significant and long term improvements to the supply chain for competitive landing gear spare parts.
- 3.3. Sub-factor Three, Order Fulfillment:** This sub-factor is acceptable when the approach, for each NSN (1) specifically and accurately describes each process IAW the applicable Technical Data Package requirements to include all tooling, equipment and material necessary for proper manufacture, (2) Accurately indicates times required for each step in the process (receipt of order to delivery), and (3) Identifies in

the process where any new purchases, manufacturing, subcontracting, or shipping is performed for the NSNs identified in section L paragraph 3.7.1 (a), (b), and (c).

3.3.1. The sub-factor is exceeded when the contractor's approach reflects process and procedure improvements that will likely result in; improved asset availability, improved asset reliability, reduced production lead times, and significant long term enhancements to the Order Fulfillment process.

3.3.2. Based on the rating for this sub-factor, an adjustment may be made to the offeror's TPP to arrive at a TEP. The magnitude the offerors TPP adjustment will be applied based on the offeror's Technical Rating, and Risk Rating for this sub-factor, IAW Table 6 below. Downward adjustments will be only be applied to the combination of ratings in Table 6. Proposed PLT increases from the baseline will receive a .2% adjustment regardless of Technical Rating or Risk Rating.

Table 3 - PLT, Adjustment Rate Determination

Sub-factor Rating	Risk Rating	Adjustment Rate for PLT Reductions
Outstanding	Low	0.2%
Good	Low	0.1%
Acceptable	Low	.05

3.3.3. Based on the Adjustment Rate for PLT Reductions in table 6 above, reductions will be applied to the applicable NSNs based on the proposed the unit price for each 1% change in PLT, and will be applied up to a 50% reduction in PLT (resulting in a maximum 10% total downward price adjustment to the TEP for each NSN).

3.3.4. An example of how this adjustment will be calculated is depicted in Table 4 below.

Table 4 - Example PLT Adjustment

NIIN	PLT Baseline	Proposed Unit Price	Proposed PLT	PLT % Change	Price Adj %	Price Adjustment	Evaluated Unit Price
1	700	\$4,500.00	400	-42.86%	-8.57%	\$(385.71)	\$4,114.29
2	650	6,000.00	650	0.00%	0.00%	0.00	6,000.00
3	300	1,000.00	200	-33.33%	-6.67%	(66.67)	933.33
4	200	1,500.00	100	-50.00%	-10.00%	(150.00)	1,350.00
5	150	800.00	200	33.33%	6.67%	53.33	853.33

IMPORTANT NOTE: Adjustments will only be made based on PLTs proposed for items identified in the “Bid-AF Parts” tab of the TEP worksheet

4. VOLUME II – FACTOR TWO, PAST PERFORMANCE

- 4.1.** Evaluation Process: The past performance evaluation considers each offeror’s demonstrated recent and relevant record of performance in supplying products and services that meet the LG-CSCI solicitation requirements. In conducting the past performance evaluation, the Government reserves the right to use both the information provided in the offeror’s past performance proposal volume and information obtained from other sources available to the Government. Other sources include, but are not limited to: the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS); Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS); Electronic Subcontract Reporting System (eSRS), or other databases; and interviews/questionnaires with Government personnel, e.g. Program Managers and Contracting Officers (COs), Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA), as well as commercial sources.
- 4.2.** The past performance evaluation results in an assessment of the offeror’s probability of meeting the LG-CSCI solicitation requirements. The performance confidence assessment rating is based on the offeror’s overall record of recency, relevancy, and quality of performance. For the past performance factor offerors will receive one of the performance confidence assessment ratings IAW Table 5.

Table 5 - Performance Confidence Assessments

Rating Descriptions	
Rating	Description
SUBSTANTIAL CONFIDENCE	Based on the offeror’s recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a high expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

SATISFACTORY CONFIDENCE	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
NEUTRAL CONFIDENCE	No recent/relevant performance record is available or the offeror's performance record is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned. The offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on the factor of past performance
LIMITED CONFIDENCE	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a low expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
NO CONFIDENCE	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has no expectation that the offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort.

- 4.3. When evaluating offeror's past performance, only recent and relevant past performance information will be considered.

Recency is defined as contract performance less than five years from the date of issuance of the solicitation.

- 4.4. Relevancy Assessment: The Government will conduct an evaluation of all recent performance information obtained to determine whether the products provided/services performed under those contracts relate to the technical sub-factors. For each recent past performance citation reviewed, the relevance of the work performed will be assessed for the Technical sub-factors. (However, all aspects of performance that relate to this acquisition may be considered). A relevancy determination of the offeror's past performance will be made based upon the aforementioned considerations, including all sub-factors identified in (RFP Section J, Attachment 5 Team Roles and Responsibilities). In determining the relevancy of effort performed under individual past performance contracts, the Government will only consider the specific effort or portion consistent with that proposed by the prime, subcontractor or teaming partner. The Past Performance Information Sheets (PPISs) and information obtained from other sources will be used to establish the relevancy of past performance. The Government will use the following relevancy definitions when assessing recent contracts.

Table 6 - Relevancy Ratings

Rating	Descriptions
VERY RELEVANT	Present/past performance effort involved essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

RELEVANT	Present/past performance effort involved similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
SOMEWHAT RELEVANT	Present/past performance effort involved some of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
NOT RELEVANT	Present/past performance effort involved little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

- 4.5.** Assigning Ratings: As a result of the relevancy and quality assessments of the recent contracts evaluated, offerors will receive an integrated performance confidence assessment rating IAW Table 4. The Past Performance Evaluation Team will review all past performance, general trends, and usefulness of the information and incorporate these into the performance confidence assessment. Although the past performance evaluation focuses on performance that is relevant to the Technical sub-factors, the resulting performance confidence assessment rating is made at the factor level and represents an overall evaluation of contractor performance. Past performance regarding predecessor companies, or subcontractors that will perform major or critical aspects of the requirement will be evaluated on an equal basis to the evaluation of the prime contractor's past performance. Offerors without a record of recent/relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance and, as a result, will receive an "Unknown Confidence" rating for the Past Performance factor.
- 4.6.** A strong record of relevant past performance will be considered more advantageous to the Government than an "Unknown Confidence" rating. Likewise, a more relevant past performance record may receive a higher confidence rating and be considered more favorably than a less relevant record of favorable performance.

5. VOLUME III – FACTOR THREE, PRICE

- 5.1.** The criteria used for evaluation of the Price Factor will be (1) Completeness, (2) Reasonableness, (3) Balance, (4) Affordability, (5) Total Proposed Price (TPP), and (6) Total Evaluated Price (TEP). The TEP will be computed and provided to the Source Selection Authority (SSA) for award purposes only and does not become part of the contract at award. However, all proposed prices provided in the TPP and used to calculate the TEP will be contractually binding.
- 5.2.** Evaluation of potential Options shall not obligate the Government to exercise such Options.

- 5.3.** Completeness: The Government will review the pricing submissions for completeness and compliance with Section L of the RFP. Incomplete price submissions may not be evaluated, and the proposal may be eliminated from the competition.
- 5.4.** Reasonableness: For a price to be considered reasonable, it must represent a price to the Government that a prudent person would pay when consideration is given to prices in the market and its affordability. Generally adequate price competition is sufficient to satisfy the requirement for ensuring price reasonableness. If adequate price competition is not obtained or if price reasonableness cannot be determined, additional information will be required to support the proposed price. All CLINs will be reviewed for price reasonableness IAW the techniques described in FAR 15.404-1.
- 5.5.** Balance: Unbalanced pricing exists when, despite an acceptable TEP, the price of one or more line items is significantly overstated or understated as indicated by the application of analysis techniques such as those defined by FAR Part 15.404-1, Proposal Analysis Techniques. The Government will analyze proposals to determine whether they are unbalanced with respect to prices, disclosed elements of price, and separately priced line items in accordance with FAR 15.404-1. An offer may be rejected if the CO determines that the lack of balance poses an unacceptable risk to the Government.
- 5.6.** Affordability: The Government will evaluate whether each offeror's Price proposal is affordable by comparing the yearly and total proposed evaluated price to budgetary information.
- 5.7.** Total Evaluated Price (TEP): The TEP will be the TPP with any adjustments made based on the offerors proposed PLTs IAW the Technical Rating and Technical Risk rating for the Order Fulfillment sub-factor.

Total Proposed Price (TPP) will be comprised of the sum of the following:

- 5.7.1.1.** The sum of the contractors proposed Fixed Prices for each NSN identified in the TEP worksheet "Bid-AF Parts" and "Bid-DLA Parts" tabs, multiplied by Government derived notional quantities applied to those NSNs
- 5.7.1.2.** The sum of the annual proposed prices for the On-site Program Manager.
- 5.7.1.3.** The sum of the proposed First Article Unit Production prices for each NSN. Notional quantities will not be applied to this element, a factor of 1 production unit will be applied for each NSN based on the proposed price for the year of performance the First Article is anticipated.
- 5.7.1.4.** The sum of the proposed First Article Test prices for each NSN. Notional quantities will not be applied to this element, a factor of 1 First Article Test will be applied for each NSN based on the proposed price for the year of performance the First Article is anticipated.

5.7.1.5. The sum of the Notional quantities and prices for the NSNs identified as “Add-AF Parts” and “Add-DLA Parts” that will be computed by the government and applied equally to each offeror’s TEP

5.8. Proposed Prices shall be fully burdened and include all direct costs, indirect costs (Overhead, General and Administrative, etc.) and profit necessary for the performance of the entire requirement.

5.9. Notional NSN quantities will be established using descriptive statistics to derive realistic expectations from historical requirements data.

5.10. PLT adjustments will be made IAW Paragraphs 3.3.2, 3.3.3, 3.3.4, as well as Table 6 “PLT Adjustment Rate Determination” and Table 7 “PLT Adjustment Example” of this document.

5.11. A no price or an omitted rate may result in an incomplete price submission.

6. VOLUME V, CONTRACT DOCUMENTATION

6.1. This volume will be reviewed for completeness. The offeror’s proposal shall include a signed copy of the SF 1443, Sections A through K, signed amendments to the solicitation (if any), and all other information required by Section L - ITO, Volume IV - Contract Documentation. An incomplete package may be excluded from the competitive range and award.

6.2. The proposal shall contain evidence of adequate financial resources. Acceptable evidence consists of a commitment or explicit arrangement that will be in existence at the time of contract award, to acquire the needed materials, equipment, personnel and other resources necessary to sustain operations.

7. SOLICITATION REQUIREMENTS, TERMS, AND CONDITIONS

7.1. Offerors are required to meet all solicitation requirements, such as terms and conditions, representations and certifications, and technical requirements, in addition to those identified as evaluation factors or sub-factors. Failure to meet a requirement may result in an offer being ineligible for award. Offerors must clearly identify any exception to the solicitation terms and conditions and provide complete accompanying rationale.

8. PRE AWARD SURVEY

8.1. The Government may conduct a Pre-Award Survey (PAS) as part of this source selection. Results of the PAS (if conducted) will be evaluated to determine each Offeror’s capability to meet the requirements of the solicitation.